## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter in this application.

New claims 6, 7 and 8 have been added and are dependent from claims 1 and 2. Support for claim 6 is found in Fig. 5 and Paragraph 0034 of the published application (U.S. 2007/0210986). Support for claim 7 is found in Fig. 5 and Paragraph 0034 of the published application. Support for claim 8 is found in Figs 6A-6C and Paragraph 0034 of the published application. Claim 1 has been amended with a limitation from the specification as well as limitations from claims 3 and 4. Support for the specification-based amendment is found in Figs. 1B, 2A-2C and paragraph 0030 of the published application. Claims 3 and 4 have been cancelled. Claim 2 has been amended with a limitation from the specification. Support for the amendment is found in Figs 6A-6C and Paragraph 0034 of the published application.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takahashi et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0064055), hereinafter "Takahashi". For at least the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicant respectfully asserts that Takahashi fails to disclose every element of amended claim 2.

Applicant has amended claim 2 to include the limitation that that the display is rotatable "about a non-horizontal axis". The display in Takahashi only discloses a display that rotates about a horizontal axis. Therefore, Takahashi fails to disclose every element in claim 2.

Furthermore, Takahashi fails to disclose a "rotatable illumination means" as claimed in claim 2. The Examiner alleges that the light source 150 on a rotatable display 105 as disclosing the "rotatable illumination means". However, Applicant respectfully submits that the disclosure

Amdt. Dated July 2, 2009 Reply to Office action of April 30, 2009

in Takahashi discloses a rotatable display portion and not a rotatable illumination means. Specifically, in claim 2, the adjective "rotatable" modifies the illumination means, and therefore, gives movement to the illumination means separate from the rest of the claimed invention. Alternatively, the range of movement in Takahashi is limited to the display portion pivoting about a horizontal axis. Therefore, Takahashi fails to disclose any movement of the illumination means, and thus it is implied that the illumination means in Takahashi remain static on the display portion. Thus, Takahashi fails to disclose a "rotatable" illumination means" as claimed in claim 2.

As a result of the above arguments, Takahashi fails to disclose limitations of claim 2. As Takahashi does not disclose each and every limitation set forth in amended claim 2, Takahashi fails to anticipate amended claim 2. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Lo (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0047073), hereinafter "Lo", in view of Choi (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0133817), hereinafter "Choi". The limitations from claim 3 have been amended into claim 1. Thus, Lo does not disclose "wherein a first rotational position illuminates the console using a first illumination means, wherein a second rotational position illuminates the console using a second illumination means, and wherein a third rotational position illuminates the console with a third illumination means; wherein the first illumination means further comprises the second and third set of plural illumination means to illuminate the console, and wherein the second illumination means is not the third illumination means" as claimed in amended claim 1. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching that the above limitations are disclosed in Choi. Therefore, even if Lo were combined with Choi, the combination of Lo and Choi fails to teach or otherwise render obvious or predictable every limitation of claim 1.

Amdt. Dated July 2, 2009 Reply to Office action of April 30, 2009

With further reference to claim 1, the limitations from claim 4 have also been amended into claim 1. Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Lo in view of Choi, and in further view of Sprott et al. (U.S. No. 5,057,024), hereinafter "Sprott". Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Lo, Choi and Sprott, is improper and fails to render claim 1 obvious, as the references are not properly combinable. Sprott discloses a computer controlled illuminated globe. One of ordinary skill in the art would not look to an educational, electronic almanac tool when solving the issue of illuminating a computer console. Therefore, Sprott is not properly combinable with Lo and Choi. Thus, the prior art of record fails to render amended claim 1 obvious.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Lo in view of Choi, and in further view of Onodera (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0006958), hereinafter "Onodera". Claim 5 is directly dependent on claim 1, and as the prior art of record fails to render claim 1 obvious, claim 5 is patentable for at least the same reasons as the parent claim.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 6 to 8 are neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the prior art of record. The prior art of record fails to disclose illumination means that is rotatable about an axis that is horizontal with respect to the console and perpendicular to a viewing panel of a display.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned agent to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Appl. No. 10/596,927 Amdt. Dated July 2, 2009 Reply to Office action of April 30, 2009

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our

Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.: NIHE-40810.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: /michaelwgarvey/ Michael W. Garvey, Reg. No. 35,878

1801 East 9th Street Suite 1200

Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108 (216) 579-1700

Date: July 2, 2009